DOCUMENT RESUME

EC 004 335

ED 031 864

CEC Selected Convention Papers; Annual International Convention: Teacher Education.
Council for Exceptional Children, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Apr 69
Note-9p.; CEC Selected Convention Papers from the Annual International Convention (46th, New York City, April 14-20, 1968).
Available from-(Selected Convention Papers) The Council for Exceptional Children; NEA; 1201 Sixteenth St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20003 ($2.00)
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
Descriptors-Abstracts, *Conference Reports, *Exceptional Child Education, Field Instruction, Inservice Teacher Education, Interaction Process Analysis, Student Teaching, Teacher Attitudes, *Teacher Education, *Teacher Education Curriculum

Reports on teacher education provide information on the following: the rationale versus the reality in teacher education programs from a student viewpoint by Joellyn Rose; and integrating practice and theory in teacher education curriculums. Abstracts of articles in this area include teaching learning processes in observation seminars, and the field conference as an experiment in practicum for teacher educators. This unit of reports is available in microfiche. (WW)

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE AND
PUBLISHER'S PRICES. MICRO-
FICHE REPRODUCTION ONLY.

SELECTED CONVENTION PAPERS

46th Annual International Convention

New York City

April 14-20, 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED uO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Council for Exceptional Children, NEA

1201 Sixteenth Street, Northwest, Washington, D. C. 20036

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted work has been granted to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office to Education to reproduce documents included in the ERIC system by means of microfiche only, but this right is not conferred to any users of the microfiche received from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. Further reproduction of any part requires permission of the copyright owner.

ED031864

TEACHER EDUCATION: RATIONALE VERSUS REALITY
A STUDENT POINT OF VIEW

by

Joellyn N. Rose

The growing trend towards the education of the multiply handicapped child is the basis for this discussion of my college preparation for teaching. I believe it will take a much wider field of knowledge even within the framework of special education to deal with the growing awareness of the multiple complexities of any handicapped child. I would hope that all of the following comments could be tempered with a basic liberal arts education, the backbone of a multiply equipped teacher.

My undergraduate work was done at two institutions: Kalamazoo College (freshman and sophomore), a fine private liberal arts school, where I first met retarded children as a worker at the Dixon State School for the retarded in Illinois; and Western Michigan University, where the bulk of my teacher education training was received.

This discussion is divided into three main topics: Rationale Being Reality, Rationale Versus Reality, and Rationale Becoming Reality. The first section includes the contributions and strong points of my training program.

Rationale Being Reality

First of all, Western had a relatively small, close knit, and well integrated special education department, with most students retaining their identity. In a university as newly enlarged and consequently unorganized as Western, the closeness of the department was appreciated. Our classes were sometimes small, ten to fifteen students, sometimes larger. Oddly enough, it was not always the smallest class from which the most was gained, although classes of more than 25 to 30 people would have been too large.

A second strong point of my training that could have been used more often was the use of outside speakers. Two that particularly impressed me were Dr. James O. Smith and Dr. Herbert Goldstein, both eminently qualified to speak and be heard in special education. There were others also--a behavioral psychologist, a biologist, a teacher, and the director of the Educational Research Center, for example, who added depth and breadth to our understanding.

Field trips were more educational than recreational, a reversal of high school policies. Many students had ever seen retarded children in great enough numbers to be really impressed by the multitude of complexities often accompanying "simple" retardation. We visited a state institution and various educable mentally handicapped and trainable mentally handicapped classes. It would have been beneficial to have also seen a private school situation, perhaps a clinic such as a child guidance center, and to have attended even a mock up of a medical and/or educational staffing. I have done this on my own, but a class attendance with ensuing discussions would have been more meaningful.

Teachers are, for example, expected to attend a "future placement" type staffing at the end of each year, and prior experience in this area would be helpful.

One of the best courses I had was the class in all areas of exceptionality, which gave a good overview of all special children and put some perspective on my own future role with them.

The importance and growing awareness of the needs of multiply handicapped children is another area substantially engrained in my own department's program. However, this awareness could be more strongly emphasized with accents on emotional and perceptual problems, and, to some extent, physical capabilities. Most severely physically handicapped children will not be cared for in an educable classroom, but vision and hearing defects are more prevalent than in a regular classroom, as is poor coordination. For example, out of the 14 children who are in my room eight can copy from the board--if they are right in front of the work to be done and less than ten feet away. This could also be a perceptual problem but two already wear glasses and three more have been recommended for optical testing by the vision screenings at school. Seven out of the 14 children showed some evidence of hearing loss when recently tested at school.

Another point for the inclusion of related classes in the curriculum is the invaluable pointers picked up in the class on speech correction, taught by the speech pathology department. Almost my entire class has substitutions of one kind or another, (w/l, w/r) and one child can say only six initial consonants. Group classroom instruction in speech sounds aids everyone concerned, most of all the children, through reinforcement and repetition.

A fifth reality were the required courses in elementary education. I found the courses in math, art, and music much more beneficial than that of the teaching of reading, almost entirely on the strength of the individual instructor's abilities and knowledge. As my training in child growth and development was with the psychology department at Kalamazoo College, my knowledge in this area was rather different than that of fellow students at Western Michigan who took the class from the education department. While I can't judge because I have not taken both courses, I seemed to have remembered more than most of my friends.

Finally, the methods and materials course was of real benefit in that there were many graduate teachers in the class and their presentations of methods and materials was more nourishing than a textbook example or list. Many of the materials presented in that class are being used today in my classroom, and others are being explored for possible county wide use.

Rationale Versus Reality

In relation to the subject of methods and materials, I will say that, other than pointers picked up from fellow students, the main source of my training in methods was my supervising teacher during student teaching. The academic classroom experience in no way compared to the practical application found in a classroom of children. While there really is no solution for this discrepancy between intent and truth, beyond actually being in or observing a classroom, this is a possible area of improvement.

A second rationale versus reality problem was part of the student teaching block itself. At the time, the required seminars for discussion of learning were rarely ever <u>elementary</u> education in bent or supervision, let

alone special education. Some of the information, such as the National Education Association versus the American Federation of Teachers, tax base, and reimbursement was necessary, but there was very little discussion of more classroom oriented problems. A lot of the problem could have been eliminated by separation of the "seminar" from the School and Society course and/or the elementary from the secondary teachers. Many problems are common to all young children, however, so special education should not necessarily be separate from elementary education.

Point three in this category is the selection and supervision of critic or supervising teachers. There have been and are being vast improvements made in this area at Western (in the special education department), but the general system for regular students seems a bit chaotic, probably due to size. It would help to have a confidential student teacher appraisal questionnaire of the supervising teacher. I am sure most "bad apples" would be eventually eliminated if enough honest and sincere students criticized a supervisor's lack of methods, materials, or classroom personality.

Rationale Becoming Reality

Number One in this category would without question be a five year course of study for special education teachers. One could finish in four years if necessary by going all year around, but more courses are necessary to make a well rounded teacher than are currently required.

I am firmly convinced that one course added to all elementary and even secondary teacher education requirements would really help to promote better understanding and cooperation between "special" and "normal" teachers: a course in exceptional children. All main categories of exceptionality could be covered with some detail. This course, given at the freshman and sophomore level, might recruit special education teachers. Students leaning toward special education could then take further courses in the areas of their interests--perhaps to obtain a degree. The main benefit, however, would still be to give some idea of what goes on in special education to future fellow teachers. I might add that I do not think the course should be watered down in the least for mass injection into education students. That would defeat the purpose of the course in the first place and perhaps recruit easy going middle of the roaders.

Included in a list of more course work in related fields would be more art, both creative and craft work, especially for primary teachers. Often an art teacher is nonexistent, unavailable, or unable to cope with the limited skills of a primary Type A room. While I do consult with our art teacher, who is very capable, about projects for my class, it often takes me hours to scale projects down to a reasonably successful fun activity time. I doubt if the art teacher has the time.

Music is another area in which the special teacher needs help finding things to do with music in the classroom. Rhythm, sound, and listening activities are usually musically oriented. A creative music methods and materials class would fill gaps left by the Music for the Classroom Teacher class.

Physical education is not all games. Our program is a selected integration of Doman-Delacato, Kephart, and Locke-Rose (our gym instructor and myself) activities designed to improve coordination and perception. I am not sure this type of information would be found in a college physical education

class, but it must be found somewhere. A child is not going to learn to read if he doesn't even know which side of his body you are moving for him.

A class in the teaching of elementary science would also be useful. While the units are usually brief, the true nature of science exploration and experimentation is tasted for the first time (usually) in the first school years. A child in the third grade probably won't be too excited about a thorough study of the reproductive system of a flower if he has no idea how to relate the information or make it come to life.

Mathematics and language arts are probably the two most important areas of learning to a retarded child. Without any number concepts, for instance, a boy can't really play football, and without language arts, he can't write home about the score. Modern mathematics has a lot to offer, perhaps especially to a retarded child. I think future teachers should have a firm grasp of the modern math program before trying to teach that a one (1) is different from a two (2). As for language arts, a special course in reading and/or language art activities would be more beneficial than a course that investigates the comparisons and contrasts of different publishing houses' products.

It is unfortunate that psychology is not usually allowed as a teachable minor for an undergraduate. I would like to have had more, particularly in the child development and testing (results and interpretation) areas.

Related to major field course work could be a second advanced course for all special education majors and interested persons. I would also like to see some advanced courses in speech therapy, such as articulation disorders, a course in emotionally disturbed children, and one in perceptual handicaps, to be recommended if not required. I very much enjoyed my class on the physically handicapped and liked to observe the deaf children in our preschool program for the physically handicapped in particular. A minor addition to the education of the mentally handicapped class could be curriculum planning for a given class of real children, rather than the imagined ones.

A fourth area open to improvement is that of actual work or observation experiences with variously handicapped children. A cadet teaching program similar to that used in many high schools could be used to aid freshman and sophomores in relating academic learning to actual practice. Volunteer tutoring or teacher aide services would be beneficial for the college student as well as the pupil or pupils. Another improvement would be split terms of student teaching, the first in one's junior year and lasting perhaps only four to six weeks. This experience would give a background for the later courses on methods or materials, and students' experience would allow them to discuss specific problems. The senior (or fifth year) student would then have a regular 16 week semester of teaching in a Type A classroom and eight weeks in a regular class, or whatever is necessary to satisfy state requirements. From experiences of others and myself, one does become impatient to get in the classroom after student teaching for any length of time, so adjustments would probably have to be made so as not to totally frustrate the future teacher.

Fifth, I would like to see a materials class (optional or elective) dealing only with new or currently researched educational aides and methods, perhaps encompassing all of elementary education. It is much easier for a new teacher to experiment with a new tool than for a twenty year veteran to switch. As a part of this proposal, I would like to see research participation with the faculty offered to interested and capable students.

Sixth, as part of the student teaching block seminar, if not before, there could be seminars with actual teacher participation. Perhaps this Type A teacher could present her class of children, or a selected few, descriptively and realistically for the first portion of the seminar and then have her problems made open to discussion, suggestions, and solutions. Or maybe the teachers and student teachers could just meet and discuss their problems. To avoid toe stepping, the group could be split, one half students meeting with the other half's teachers and vice versa.

Sandwiched in someplace should be workshop and local conference attendance on a broadening scale. To top off the whole five year program, the graduate would have a basic liberal arts education. Maybe this sounds as if it is asking too much of an undergraduate and would leave no time for vacations, relaxation, and recreation. But on a five year basis, I believe it could be done and I think such a program would produce more adept, mature teachers.

ABSTRACT

THE TEACHING LEARNING PROCESSES IN OBSERVATION SEMINARS

by

Thomas M. Shea

This research deals with certain aspects of the broad and complex problem of studying the effectiveness of the teaching learning process. Specifically, it is concerned with designing and testing objectively verifiable procedures for the analysis and description of the classroom process in a natural setting. Using the social interactionist's model for small group study, the investigator applied various instruments to quantify the classroom process and develop a meaningful, yet objective, description of that process. The subjects were two Special Education Observation Seminars.

In order to describe the teaching learning process, it is desirable to obtain a set of indices of the structure and dynamics of interaction in such groups as the seminars. Among the instruments used in this study were interaction process analysis, questionnaires concerning attitudes and feelings of the participants, personality tests, various time and interaction rate measures, and sociometric instruments. The data obtained from the application of these instruments and from the analysis provide descriptions of three elements--the total group, the instructor, and the student members of the seminar.

This paper focuses on two descriptive indices which are discussed in detail, i.e., interaction profiles, and Who to Whom matrices. The investigator also presents a brief overview of the social interactionists model for small group study and the Bales' System of Interaction Process Analysis.

The results of the analysis of the data indicate that, although control exercised in previous small group laboratory studies was not applied in this investigation, the social interactionist's model is applicable for the purpose of describing the observation seminar process in the natural classroom setting.

The need for the development and application of observation techniques

in research on teaching and the necessity for conducting multiple variable research on teaching and its effectiveness is demonstrated.

Implications for future research focus on suggestions for improving the observational techniques applied, the need for measurable objectives in instruction, interaction process analysis as a method of observer training, and the application of seminar analysis as a feedback system to improve instruction and group functioning in the classroom.

INTEGRATING THEORY AND PRACTICE IN TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUMS

by

Joseph J. Eisenbach

If those engaged in the preparation of teachers in colleges and universities throughout the United States are sensitive to criticisms emanating from personnel in public and private schools, clinics and social agencies, it should become abundantly clear that teacher education curriculums are in dire need of review and updating. With alarming consistency and dogged determination, graduates of our curricular models continue to question the efficacy of present modes of professional preparation. To be sure, there are always those who harken back to the good old days when more emphasis was placed on practical solutions to educational problems and less concern was shown for theories and abstract educational prescriptions. Nonetheless, a discernible segment of the profession continues to plead for the juxtaposition of theory and practice. Those who wish to become actively involved in examining, applying, and evaluating theoretical models appropriate to education and closely related disciplines have, in the past, been discouraged and at times ridiculed. However, as long as professional preparation stressed the practical approach to teaching, accompanied by an array of techniques and a multitude of paraphernalia, teachers will be inadequately prepared to cope with all of the behavioral complexities presented in a classroom at any level in our educational system. One cannot deny the fact that techniques and hardware provide some educators emotional security and professional status. Likewise, certain school systems enhance their image in the eyes of their patrons with attractive displays of expensive equipment and materials. Nevertheless, competent educators and informed critics of our profession appear to agree that even in this technological era teachers must always be the masters of the machines they employ and the architects of their institutional plans and stratagems. How then might such mastery be attained?

At the outset, those responsible for developing a curriculum for the preparation of teachers must determine the nature of the product they intend to nurture, train, and develop. In performing this arduous task, high priority must be given to the mission of discerning requisite objectives stated in behavioral terms. Once these behaviors have been defined and delineated, attention must then be directed toward sequencing, teaching, and developing these goals. Although the designer of this professional undertaking becomes immediately involved in the integration of theory and practice when selected behaviors pertinent to conducting an institutional program are defined, their most formidable responsibility will be the development of a scheme that will provide a sequential offering of experiences combined with periodic evaluations of each professional aspirant.

Timing of experiences is a significant task to be achieved. Undergraduates who are in the terminal stages of their preparation are firmly convinced that greater emphasis should have been placed on providing opportunities to observe children and participate in various types of educational programs from the beginning of their training sequence. They claim that this makes their professional training more meaningful. Many professors are quick to support this point of view. Why? Have collegiate institutions been derelict in meeting the demands of their students? Do students and professors tend to assume that personal involvement with children, with or without supervision and in instruction, is a legitimate substitute for college classroom instruction? Both of these questions can be responded to in an affirmative manner. However, observations and participation should not be considered a panacea which will quell the criticisms of teacher preparation voiced by able students or offer immediate enrichment of present day teacher education sequences. In thinking about this problem, one is confronted with a time factor. When does one begin teacher preparation and at what point is this task considered to be terminated? Undoubtedly, there is a diversity of opinion among students and professors. Since experimental research data pertinent to this issue are practically nonexistent, tradition and practice appear to serve as major determinants of the length of the professional training period. A typical pattern of professional preparation places the would be teacher in a two year liberal arts instructional program prior to admission to the two year professional sequence. Perhaps the issue at stake is how optimal benefits can be derived from these final two years of undergraduate professional preparation.

To acquire balanced and enriched professional sequences in teacher education it is suggested that:

1. Institutional commitment to enhancing professional curricula include more than requesting students to observe and participate in various settings. While students derive much personal satisfaction from their contacts with children and youth, it is unrealistic to equate this manifestation of preprofessional interest with professional competence. Instead, if preservice training is to be utilized to the fullest extent, competent professional staff must be assigned to assist and guide students in their early explorations into teaching. Students should be directed to examine behaviors observed in various settings, discuss possible causes of such behavior, and determine courses of action a teacher might initiate in shaping children's behaviors.

2. As students advance in their professional training, collegiate classroom instruction may interrelate theory and practice by (a) providing live demonstrations of the application of methodology being proposed, (b) presenting televised productions designed to highlight a specific practice or technique, and (c) providing each student an opportunity to demonstrate his ability in the implementation of certain selected skills and understandings. In every instance, however, the student is entitled to know the basic underlying hypotheses of the method being applied, material used, and the objective to be attained. This enables the student to become cognizant of strengths and weaknesses inherent in educational methodology and materials and endows him with sufficient expertise to begin to determine and prescribe professional behaviors appropriate to individuals and groups to be instructed. Likewise, the collegiate instructor is obligated to present not one but several possible theoretical models for students to examine and evaluate. Contemporary educators are sometimes inclined to imbue their students with a single approach to teaching.

While educators of exceptional children have advanced the concept of individualized educational programing, it should be noted, and with some justifiable concern, that an increasing emergence of cults threatens to restrict the development of professional competence. Those who become devoted to the doctrines of these transitory groups invest all of their energies in defending the cult's dogma, resisting and deriding other educational designs and systems, and enhancing their own position by extensive recruitment. Consequently, capable but unthinking students become entrapped and fail to realize the shortcomings of their professional preparation.

An increased proliferation of behavioral, neurological, and educational categories in special education has, to some extent, enabled professional forces to zero in on the atypical individual. However, the current task of integrating theory and practice in preparing teachers and ancillary personnel in special education cannot be accomplished as long as adherence to and identification with a particular group or category continues to serve as the major qualification for becoming an educator. If a theoretical position is so tenuous that it cannot withstand an intelligent and penetrating analysis, and be compared to other positions, its inclusion in an educational training model should be questioned. Exposure to and understanding of major theoretical positions applicable to educating exceptional children enables the practitioner to render his services in an intelligent and competent manner appropriate to the needs of those he instructs. Therefore, it is imperative that undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in special education curriculums be confronted with a multitheoretical teacher education curricular model.

Professional competence should not be assumed when various theories have been examined and learned. Unless the student is afforded an opportunity to test and apply theories he has learned, his competence will be limited. Consequently, from the time that initial observations are planned to the completion of directed or practice teaching or practicum, emphasis should be placed on interrelating theory and practice. Unfortunately, classroom teachers and teacher educators are frequently hypercritical of educational theories and theorists. Yet, in their daily performance of their responsibilities, they rely on personal opinions and hypotheses that are frequently less substantial than current theories offered by some academicians.

When a person advances his professional competence to the level at which he realizes that the composition of his behaviors and the manner in which they are displayed in the presence of his students constitute his preliminary credentials for teaching, he has achieved one of the hallmarks of the profession.

ABSTRACT

THE FIELD-CONFERENCE: AN EXPERIMENT IN PRACTICUM FOR TEACHER EDUCATORS

by

James M. Crowner

A conference type, short term practicum is described wherein 11 Special Education teacher educators and doctoral students from three

university campuses in Illinois and Missouri spent three days of intensive study of the Tucson, Arizona Special Education program. The "Field Conference" emphasized almost continuous dialogue with key administrators in the Tucson program, in addition to site visits, films and special lectures--all directed toward an understanding of administrative practices which might account for the success of the Tucson program. Special emphasis was placed on the study of the "Covert Project"--a multidisciplinary, multifaceted approach to serving disturbed children through the public schools and to the Tucson program for the mentally retarded.

The paper describes the method used in determining specific and general conference goals and details the process whereby the experience was evaluated. In a followup report, all participants, both visitors and hosts, demonstrated considerable enthusiasm for the project. The prospects for future experiences of a similar nature are outlined.

GENERAL SESSIONS

PROSPECTS FOR ADVENTURE IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

by

James J. Gallagher

I might have been addressing this convention as a President of the Council for Exceptional Children. However, in this world of ours a lot of unexpected things happen. So, instead of being CEC's President, I am addressing you as the head of the new Bureau of Education for the Handicapped in the U S Office of Education. I think you are entitled to an explanation. Certainly Leo Connor and John Kidd, who had to bear the burden of this switch, deserve a special explanation.

Looking back, I have learned much about the earlier impressions I had about Washington, and thought I might share some of these fantasies with you. Having lived in the mid west during the more recent 13 years of my life, I had a rather romantic picture of what life would be like in Washington. I knew that there would be many demands put upon me. I knew there would be lunches in the White House, constant interviews on television's Meet the Press, cocktail parties where Dean Rusk would come over and ask my opinion on foreign policy. On those few days when there weren't cocktail parties, there would be other dinners at which music lovers would sit down and listen to Senator Dirkson sing and the government workers would let out at 3:30 or 4 o'clock everyday, so that they could get to the cocktail parties on time. I found that Washington was not quite that way, but I have made the adjustment.

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

Today, I would like to spend some time talking about the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped and what the Bureau stands for. I hope that when I am finished, I will have communicated to you sufficiently a sense of excitement about the new opportunities for handicapped children through Federal assistance.

Most of you have already received your March 1968 issue of the Exceptional Children. The entire issue is devoted to the programs of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. This issue describes the organization and operation in more complete detail than I could possibly do in a speech. So, I am not going to talk about organization. Rather, I am going to talk about some of our various programs. I want to take this opportunity, also, to thank Executive Secretary Bill Geer and his very fine staff in The Council for Exceptional Children for allowing us to present this total story in a single issue of the journal.

As Dr. Kirk mentioned, the Bureau as well as the National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children was established last year. One of the major functions of the Bureau is to provide a central responsibility within the United States Office of Education to deal with all matters involving educational programs for handicapped children. The Bureau is also charged with the responsibility for providing consultation and advice to the U S Commissioner of Education on all matters relating to handicapped children.

Bureau Operations

There are currently six operating Bureaus within the Office of Education of which the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped is one. A three dimensional operation comprises the Bureau organization: Research, Training, and Services. The combined focus of these three areas of operation is to develop a blend of resources to meet the needs of tomorrow, and then the needs of the day after tomorrow.

Research. The Division of Research, directed by Dr. James Moss, had carried out an operational program for approximately three years before the unit was made a part of the Bureau. The focus of the research program has always been on the systematic application of knowledge to educational problems. While we believe that knowledge, for its own sake, is a valuable goal, it is not a major goal of the Bureau. Instead, we seek out research studies and developmental projects that give promise of strengthening all facets of education for the handicapped.

One example of these efforts is the number of reseach projects being conducted by a number of different research centers throughout the United States which are concerned with behavior modification. No one needs to tell teachers how much time they must spend in attempting to modify the inappropriate behavior of the children in their classes. We believe that some of the research now being supported definitely indicates that there are methods available which can and have substantially improved the teachers' ability to handle this behavior meaningfully. To over simplify the issue--research suggests that teachers and parents often approach behavior problems in the wrong way. They have been paying attention to the negative and ignoring the positive behavior of the child. Many teachers will ask -- what positive behavior? But as some of us know through personal experience a youngster cannot spend more than 30 percent of his time in unacceptable behavior. This means that 70 percent of his time is spent doing something which is reasonably acceptable. This research on behavior modification suggests that rewards are important to the child and should be given systematically and regularly at the time he is behaving properly. Usually we find that the teacher often breathes a sign of relief when he finally settles down for a short period of time, and she leaves him to do whatever he wishes. The only time the child gets substantial amounts of attention is when he is misbehaving. When he is showing the proper kinds of behavior that should be solidified or reinforced, the child goes unnoticed. Research studies show rather conclusively that improved behavior can be obtained by setting up the classroom environment somewhat differently, and by training teachers to assure that the child is systemically rewarded for proper behavior. This is one example of a substantial research contribution which directly aids the classroom teacher.

Another research program involves a major effort through the investment of over $2 million in the development of a network of special education instructional materials centers. Fourteen centers are now established throughout the Nation, in addition to the Clearinghouse at the Council for Exceptional Children (ERIC) in Washington, D. C., which is designed to make the latest materials and classroom techniques readily available to teachers. In addition to these fourteen centers, over 70 associate centers and six major mobile units have been set up to facilitate distribution in the various States. We have over 30,000 teachers who have registered for help and assistance through these instructional materials centers.

No one connected with this complex and difficult network pretends that it has yet fulfilled its original goals. The ways in which to communicate new ideas, to develop new materials, to transmit these materials, and to prepare the

teacher to use them is still very much in the experimental stage. This is why it is considered a research effort.

We are pleased, however, that the various budget requests that have been made for the Division of Research suggest that the Administration supports this effort and is now asking Congress to appropriate $13.0 million, approximately 25 percent more money in Fiscal Year 1969 for this program than was available in Fiscal Year 1968.

I'd like to tell you of some of the brief facts of life regarding the budget. When we propose a budget, it goes through a large number of reviews. First, it is reviewed by the Office of Education; second, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; third, by the Bureau of the Budget; and finally, by Appropriation Subcommittees of the House and the Senate who then go into conference and make the final decision. That final decision has not yet been made. So, the $13.9 million refers to the request made after the reviews by the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Bureau of the Budget.

Training. A second major and crucial dimension of our operation is concerned with the development of trained personnel. Twenty-four and a half million dollars was authorized and programed for the support of students and institutions last year for the purpose of supporting the training of 14 thousand specialists; over four thousand of whom were full time students. There is no more important task than the provision for well trained persons in any comprehensive program for the education of handicapped children.

I would like to comment on two special facets of our training program. One is the concept of program development. It has provided small sums of money to colleges and universities that wish to begin planning for the developing of new career training programs in a given area of handicapped children. A total of 269 program development grants have been given to colleges and universities, including 56 last year. Of these developmental grants that have reached a two year conclusion, we find that 183 were actually converted to full time training programs receiving support for Traineeships and Fellowships, while only 30 were not converted to training programs. This means that over 85 percent of the programs which were initially stimulated in this fashion actually came into existence. Thus, due to these program development grants, there are 183 active training programs which did not exist before.

A second point worth noting is a new dimension now being developed under the leadership of Dr. Leonard Lucito, the Director of the Division of Training Programs. This dimension is called Special Projects. In addition to the training of teachers, administrators, and others in existing programs, there is a need to offer the means by which training can be provided for new roles and additonal specialists in the total programs for handicapped children. You have heard these discussions just as I have, and we have them again in our Regional Conferences. It is this entire dimension of personnel support to be considered, with the discussion of the training of supervisors, of the people who teach trainers, the training of teacher trainers, of teachers of preschool handicapped children, child development specialists, as well as a host of other creative training concepts that have lacked the vehicle of support for a fair test. The purpose of this Special Projects Unit is to support institutions which are interested in an adventure in the development of new training roles for the handicapped. We are very pleased that the various review processes up to Congress have responded to our request for $30 million for this program for fiscal year 1969. This would represent an increase of 25 percent over the amount made available last year.

Educational Services. The third major dimension of our Bureau is concerned with the total area of educational services. One could view the research program and the training program as representing a determined attack on the problems of the handicapped for the day after tomorrow. It takes time for the benefits of these programs to reach the youngster.

But attention must also be focused on the immediate problems. This is the purpose and basic function of our Division of Educational Services under the leadership of Dr. Frank Withrow. Three major programs are involved: first is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title VI-A, Aid to the State program. All but one or two of the 50 states have now submitted state plans for establishing priorities on the basis of the growing needs of handicapped children. The available funds, $14.25 million this year, were distributed to the States roughly on a population basis. These programs would attempt to help extend and provide innovative services for the handicapped. The states have established the following priorities: (a) the multiply handicapped, (b) preschool programs, (c) work study programs and secondary programs for the handicapped, and (d) the area of specific learning disabilities.

Second is the program known as Public Law 89-313, an amendment to Title I of the ESEA, which provides assistance to over 700 State and State supported institutions throughout the United States. These institutions have improved and extended many areas such as recreation programs and curriculum provisions. In addition, they have begun preschool programs, parent counseling programs, and many others. These programs have provided assistance to institutions that many of us know have been islands in the sea of educational change.

A third major program in the area of educational services is the Captioned Films Program. Concerned initially with the area of the deaf, it has now been extended to all areas of the handicapped. The Captioned Films Program distributed materials and provides recreational films for deaf adults. One of the most interesting commitments of this program is that a certain minimal amount of audiovisual equipment has been placed in virtually every classroom for deaf children in the United States. Over 3,500 overhead projectors, screens, and filmstrip projectors have thus far been distributed to accomplish this goal. In addition, this service supports research in materials development, and training in the use of media, because if teachers are not trained to use the equipment, the equipment remains on the shelf and gathers dust.

The projected increase from 1968 to 1969 for these service programs under the education improvement for the handicapped increased from $41.7 million to $64.5 million, a request for an increase of over 50 percent.

Each of the three basic program areas hope for some increase over 1968: the educational services program, over 50 percent; the training programs and research programs, about 25 percent each.

In addition, we are responsible for four new programs which have been added by the recent Congress. We will now have authority to develop educational resource centers, deaf blind centers, physical education and recreation programs for the handicapped, and to provide information and recruitment.

It is logical that when one talks in terms of a $100 million, it sounds like a great deal of money; indeed it is. But we must remember that the Federal government is merely a junior partner in this great educational effort. About eight percent of the total amount of money spent on education in this country (eight cents of every dollar) is provided by the Federal government. A somewhat similar percentage is provided for the education of the handicapped. There are

no circumstances indicated whereby the Federal government would be ready to assume the major share of that burden. What we can do is to provide you with the extra resources to test new ideas, to encourage you to try more effective training programs, and to support investigations in research and to develop more effective educational services. The major financial burden for educating handicapped children will remain, as it always has, at the local and state level.

Bureau Field Relationships

Now, what does the Bureau stand for? One of my very personal interests in coming into the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped is a deep concern about the quality of relationship that should exist between the people working in the field and in the Office of Education. There are important changes in the area of education in general, and it is crucial that we establish effective working relationships between the Office of Education and the State Departments of Education, the colleges, the universities, and the local education agencies. One of the things we are facing are projections that take education for the handicapped into the future five or ten years. The crucial questions regarding long range planning always revolve around who is doing the planning. What role does the public play? How can one obtain a meaningful degree of democratic participation in long range program development and planning which is often more suited for small group activities? The Handicapped programs within the Office of Education have always relied upon the advice and consultation of the field: the committees, panels, field readers, site visitors, and many other informal contacts. The National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children gives us one more valuable resource in this regard.

One of the ways by which we are attempting to strengthen this new partnership this year centers on the holding of seven regional conferences, designed to develop new directions for handicapped children. Two of these conferences have already been held: one in San Francisco and one in Birmingham. We have five more which will be finished by the end of June. These are designed as working conferences in which a cross section of persons from many areas in special education, from a particular region, are invited to sit down and discuss what they believe to be the major problems that need attention to identify the kinds of obstacles that we face which keep us from solving these problems and to give us some ideas on the kinds of solutions that they see as desirable and needed in their own area.

When the results of all of these conferences are put together, we hope we will form a major policy document which represents not just the thinking of the staff of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, but the thinking of representative groups in the field. These tentative policy statements will then be carried forth through further dissemination at professional meetings such as the Council for Exceptional Children. Here again there are opportunities for suggestions and modification, but in the final analysis, we hope to have fully established what would represent the major problem and major solutions that we must be concerned with. These statements that we can make from the standpoint of the Bureau will be a consensus of the various professionals in the field and not a set of statements hastily composed by a few bureaucrats in Washington.

We intend to have as much face to face contact with you as possible regarding our programs on the basis that almost any problem can be met by people of good will, and also because letters and memos and written communications often do not communicate.

The point that I am really anxious to get across to you is that we in special education are all in the same boat and if someone clumsily punches a hole in the bottom, we won't have time to complain about his clumsiness, because we

are all going to be too busy bailing out the boat. So, if one of us at the federal level, state level, or the local level tries too hard to peer into the future and falls out of the bell tower, ask not for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.

Any good thing happening in special education, or in speech psychology, or affecting children with learning disabilities enhances us all and we all need to rejoice. We now have a real opportunity to work together and we must make the most of it.

Just last month, I accompanied the United States Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe II, to Nashville, Tennessee, where he gave a speech at the dedication of the new John F. Kennedy Center. I think you would be interested in a few words of his on that occasion, and I quote from his speech entitled "New Hope for the Handicapped."

> In providing first quality education for handicapped children, we are merely fulfilling our pledge that every American youngster shall receive as much education as he needs to give him a fair crack at a full life.
>
> After decades of ignoring the contradictions between our words and our deeds, the United States is now about the business of achieving equality of educational opportunity. We are resolved that every one of our children will have the opportunity to become all that he is capable of becoming--all of them, not just white ones, not just those from fortunate families, not just those born into educated homes. We have decided that our black children, our poor children, our Indian and our Spanish speaking children will have that same chance....that this pledge of educational opportunity includes handicapped children as well. The mentally retarded, the deaf, the blind, the brain injured--these are American children, too, and they must have the American chance. They must have the American hope --and they will get it.

We have the opportunity to work together for all areas of the handicapped. Our pledge to you also reflects the desire of the specialists in the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped to work with you to create a better education for all handicapped children.

ADDRESS TO THE FIRST GENERAL SESSION OF THE 46TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

by

Samuel A. Kirk

When Congress amended the Elementary and Secondary Education Act by Title VI, it created two organizational structures, the Bureau for Education of Handicapped Children and a statutory National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped. These two organizations are only one year old in the United States and are relatively unique as far as the creation of administrative organizations by Congress goes.

Although we are all aware of the reasons and the need for creating a Bureau for Handicapped Children, many people ask, "Why another committee; why do we need committees at all? The simplest answer to this question is that Ameri-

cans cannot live without committees. You may have heard the comment that if two Americans parachuted from a plane, they would form a committee before they landed. Administrators often find committees very useful for other reasons than their genuine interest in gaining the benefit of other points of view. When asked to make decisions they do not want to make, they may appoint a committee to study the problem, hoping that it will blow over by the time the committee completes its deliberations. Another useful function of committees is that they allow the administrator to escape the responsibility of making unpopular decisions. The committee can always be blamed. At other times, the administrator doesn't want the sole responsibility for a decision, so appoints a committee to share it. This might be dangerous since the committee may come up with decisions the administrator doesn't like. In uuch situations, the committee can be loaded with people who agree with the administrator; otherwise the committee can be troublesome.

In spite of these facetious remarks about committees, they do seem to be primarily an American phenomenon. Federal bureaus traditionally call on specialists in the field to help them with decision making. Most of the committees are appointed for a specific task such as awarding grants for research or for service. Most of the committees are created by Federal bureaus themselves as a matter of course. The National Advisory Committee that will be discussed in this paper, however, was created by Congress, and is, therefore, a statutory committee, designed to advise the Commissioner of Education, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Congress of the United States concerning programs and policies related to the education of the handicapped.

The History and Work of the Office of Education and the Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped.

Before the duties of this committee are described, I would first like to discuss, briefly, the development of Federal programs for exceptional children in the United States. It might be well for us, at this time, to review historically the development of the Federal programs for the handicapped.

Up to 1931, we had few, if any, programs for handicapped children in the U S Office of Education. The White House conference of 1929 recommended that a section for exceptional children and youth be organized in the Office of Education. It was organized in 1931 and remained a section of Exceptional Children and Youth until 1963. Between 1931 and 1957, a period of 26 years, no special appropriations were made by the federal government for the education of handicapped children. In 1957, Congress took the bull by the horns and appropriated one million dollars for cooperative research. Initially, this appropriation requested that two thirds of the funds be earmarked for research on mental retardation. This earmarking lasted for only two years and at the end of that time, grants for the mentally retarded began to decrease from year to year until in 1963, they reached only five percent of the total funds appropriated for cooperative research. In other words, from 1958 to 1963, the percentage of Cooperative Research funds allocated for research on the mentally retarded dropped from 67 percent to five percent.

In 1957, Congressional appropriation ushered in a second stage in the development of Federal support for special education. In 1958, the famous Public Law 85-962 was passed appropriating one million dollars for training leadership personnel in the area of mental retardation. Then, in 1960, Public Law 85-762 was passed appropriating a million and a half dollars to train teachers of the deaf. Several other significant bills were passed such as the one supporting captioned films for the deaf. In 1963, President Kennedy signed Public Law 88-164 authorizing both training and research, not only for the mentally retarded and the deaf, but also for other handicapped children. Then, in 1964, Congress appropriated approximately 15 million dollars for research and training.

In 1963, a division for Handicapped Children and Youth was organized within the Office of Education. This raised the status of special education from a section which has lasted for nearly 30 years to a division with a number of branches to handle various aspects of the work. This division performed so well that it received a presidential citation for its accomplishments during its 18 months of life, the only such citation for any subdivision of the Office of Education in its long history.

Unfortunately, when the Office of Education was reorganized into four bureaus, the Division of Handicapped Children and Youth as well as similar divisions were abolished, and the work of its various branches was scattered among different bureaus within the Office of Education where emphasis on special education became diffused and diluted. This dispersing of the work for handicapped children within different bureaus of the Office of Education created major problems in administering a unified program. Because of these problems, in 1966 Congress created a Bureau for the Education of Handicapped Children under Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This was really a historical landmark, since the work in special education was elevated to the highest level within the Office of Education. It is not a section; it is not a branch; it is not a division; it is a bureau with its own divisions, branches, and sections. No longer is the work on handicapped children in the Office of Education a stepchild of education. Furthermore, it cannot again revert to the status of a stepchild except by an act of Congress. It is the only bureau in the Office of Education that is organized as a result of a Congressional Act. All other bureaus can be abolished by administrative measures, but the only way the Bureau for Education of the Handicapped can be abolished is by a repeal or amendment of Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which created this bureau.

Hopefully, the organization of a Bureau for Education of the Handicapped has launched a new era for special education. Since 1964, Congress has continuously increased the appropriations, until this year the appropriation for all of the bills providing funds through the Office of Education for research, training, and service for handicapped children exceeds 50 million dollars. This may perhaps seem like a small appropriation for the care, education, research, and teacher training needs in an area which includes one-twelfth to one-tenth of the school population. If we, in the field, are able to justify more funds by the adequate use of existing funds at a high level accomplishment, I am certain that Congress will fulfill the commitment of our society by appropriating the further funds needed to adequately serve handicapped children.

The National Advisory Committee

So much for the history and the work of the Office of Education and the Bureau for Education of the Handicapped. To return to the original question, why did Congress also establish by law a committee to advise the Bureau? The purpose of the committee according to the Congressional Act was first to review annually the accomplishments of the Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped, second to make recommendations to the commissioner for the improvement of the bureau, and third to make recommendations to Congress through the Commissioner and the Secretary of HEW for legislation. The committee was organized in July, 1967, and met twice during that year. It has since published its annual report entitled "Special Education for Handicapped Children: Fulfillment of the Nation's Commitment." This report is currently available from the Bureau of Education of the Handicapped, in the U. S. Office of Education. For those who have not yet read this report, I would like to summarize some of its observations and recommendations.

The first task of the advisory committee was to determine the current status of the educational programs for the handicapped in the U. S. Office of Educa-

tion. The second task was to develop recommendations to the Bureau and also to Congress. In its analysis of current administration of programs for the handicapped, the National Advisory Committee was impressed with certain developments.

First, it was impressed with the fact that the Bureau was inaugurated on January 12, 196 . by the Commissioner of Education, even though Congress had allowed until July 1, 1967 for its establishment. We commended the Commissioner of Education for taking immediate action six months before it was necessary in creating this bureau and getting it started.

Second, the acquisition of leadership personnel for the Bureau for Education of the Handicapped was accomplished in a very short period of time. It is not yet complete, I understand, but rapid progress has been made. The committee said that an important factor in recruitment of effective personnel for any operation (the bureau, university, or state) is based on a high sense of purpose and the dynamics of the program. We think the Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped has these characteristics in full measure.

Third, the leadership of the Bureau was commended for establishing a creative partnership with local and state services to advance the nation's programs of research, training, and service for handicapped children. Recognizing that less than half of the nation's five million handicapped children are receiving special education services, the advisory committee made certain recommendations which I should like to list for you.

First, we thought that a comprehensive examination of program needs for handicapped children in the U. S. should be conducted. We think that such a study will require a professional and technical staff under the directoon of the National Advisory Committee. Its purpose would be to help establish priorities with the goal being nothing short of quality educational services for all handicapped children and their parents.

Second, we thought that Congress should act to reduce the large gap between program authorization (the authority to spend money) and program appropriation (assignment of money to be spent) in programs for the handicapped. The authorization under Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is 150 million dollars for 1968. The appropriation is 15 million dollars, only ten percent of the authorization. We are asking that this lag of authorization below appropriation be decreased.

We know that his is a very rich country, and that we are able to support adequately. programs for our children. As one member of the committee, I am concerned with the expenditure of funds in Asia for military purposes at the expense of adequate appropriations for the care and education of our children. We are told that we have sufficient funds for taking care of both, but as yet it has not been demonstrated by bringing appropriation up to authorization for the handicapped, for the poverty program, and for providing things that we need in this country.

Third, we thought that the Bureau for Education of the Handicapped should be provided with an adequate operating budget. The National Advisory Committee met twice. The Director of the Bureau informed us that our meetings, are at the expense of the general budget for the Bureau which is minimal for their operation.

The fourth recommendation made was that Congress should provide additional funds in research budgets for construction and operation of research and dev lopment centers that will stimulate a sustained effort in major research problems in the education of the handicapped.

The committee also pointed out that in comprehensive programs with multiple agency funding, such as model cities and neighborhood services, funds for staff representing the handicapped should be included.

The National Advisory Committee tried to delineate some of the major problems facing this country. They selected a few that we should look into and do something about.

1. Funds appropriated for research and training programs for children with learning disabilities should be substantially increased. There are no special appropriations for that program. Such additional funds necessary to define and explore this relatively new area should not be allocated at the expense of pressing program needs in established areas for the handicapped.

2. Another recommendation was that Congress should appropriate funds necessary for the development of vital programs needed for preschool education for handicapped children between the ages of three and six. This should be pursued, vigorously, since most of our research shows that we can do more for handicapped children when they are younger than we can when the children are older.

3. Research for the purpose of identifying the number, variety, and severity of handicapping conditions existing in the child population of the inner cities should be encouraged by the Bureau of the Handicapped. We think the problem of the inner cities is complex but we also know that within the inner cities we have more handicapped children than we do in the more affluent suburbs of our cities.

Another problem is that of the rural handicapped child. We have talked about the neglect of handicapped children in sparsely settled and rural areas of this country for many years, but we really haven't done very much about it. We have not yet used modern developments such as helicopters to transport children to teachers or teachers to children. We haven't used the modern communication techniques of television and the other electronics aids in rural areas. It is necessary for us not only to talk about the neglect of handicapped children in rural areas, but to come up with procedures that will implement our desires.

The committee was very pleased with the functioning of the six regional conferences the Bureau has sponsored. These conferences are designed to foster a partnership between professional people in the field and the Federal Bureau. The National Advisory Committee will study very thoroughly, the ideas and suggestions from the field that will lead to more adequate research, training, and services to handicapped children and will assist in their implementation. The major goal for all of us is to fulfill the nation's commitment to its handicapped children.

REFLECTIONS ON THE YEAR 2000

by

Leo E. Connor

Once upon a time a President of CEC told the story of special education in the following way:

"In the beginning of special education was the handicapped child and the child was with his parents. Then came the special teacher and the teacher saw the child and the teacher took the child unto his own and the parent knew the

child no longer. All things belonged to the teacher and the school. Then came the technologies and the clinicians and the diagnosticians and the teacher knew not the child. All good ideas were created by the researchers and the universities could do no wrong. And then, the Federal Government assumed all wisdom unto itself. Next, we see the states rising and taking onto themselves such power they never had. Through all time, we have had the doubters and the skeptics with us. But, in this our day, we stand amazed and confounded that all these too might pass and leave us with a new future yet to be determined (Connor, 1968)."

To look into the future is to claim the title of prophet; to look toward the future can tag one with the epitaph of visionary; to assert validity for one's predictions invites skepticism and reactions; to act upon one's vision assures one of disciples and opponents. But, to talk about the future does harm to no one, for many of you have heard the definition of the future as a discussion of the unknown, in uncertain terms, for imprecise reasons, by pompous individuals who have little to do in the present.

Yet, Yeat once said, "In dreams begin responsibilities," and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, a respected body of scholars, is currently devoting a huge expenditure of brains, time, and energy to defining the alternatives facing us in the 21st century. Kahn and Wiener's book (1967) is simply titled The Year 2000, and is replete with responsible, sober, and cautious possibilities. Such endeavors are esteemed examples to emulate and, for what it is worth, this is my presidential offering with the shaping of present thoughts toward the potential of special education.

There is a great deal of magic in the name of the year 2000! One-half to three-fourths of you will celebrate New Year's Ev[illegible] the year 1999 and watch the 21st century begin. What will you expect? Will you stand and watch the robot butler wheel across the room and let you punch the right buttons on his chest so that your drink can be served? Will you expect to pop the day's food intake pill into your mouth with the dialed drink and thus avoid wasting time at three meals? Will you expect your clothes to be made of paper, or seaweed, or some strange new substance? Or perhaps you'll have no clothes on at all and instead be clothed in a shower of lights that change color and shape constantly. Or another aspect of the year 2000 might be your wish to go home and visit your family for the New Year, and so you'll adjust your flying belt, jet out to the spaceport, and take off from your home on Mars to see your parents on earth.

Are these gadgets and inventions impossible to dream of? Not altogether, and it certainly would be fun to continue to speculate upon the extraordinary items which might become commonplace within the future of our lifetime. I have no desire to promise you a specific discovery on the education of exceptional children or a group of easier working conditions. Rather than compete with other prophets and predictors of scientific marvels, I'd like to concentrate on special education and the outline of its possible alternatives.

CEC Activities

What of CEC in the year 2000? My response is that the CEC of 1968 is more like the CEC of 2000 than most CEC'ers would think. Why? I present three major premises:

1. There is more happening in CEC than the majority of CEC'ers realize. During the past ten years, the CEC had a major revision of the constitution which has set us on the pathway to our current and future objectives. We now have 38 federations, 555 local chapters, and 9 Divisions. At the present rate of expansion and organizational progress, both the United States and Canada will be saturated with federations between 1980 and 1985. Local chapters, of

course, can be organized by 15 or more members, so there is no telling what their number will be by 2000. But, will the pattern of local chapters be changed? I doubt it. They could be abolished or so changed that there are no longer local groups of special education. Neither contingency seems very likely.

What about divisions? Well, what can 2000 bring? Do you know anything that's been left out? Since a Division for the Learning Disabilities has been confirmed, most special educators would say that few handicapped children remain to be highlighted. But even so, we stand ready to receive any kind of exceptional child. On the other hand, divisions could be planned around professional groups such as the psychologists with interest in special education; likewise with the medical doctors or the nursing group or physical therapists, etc. None of this is startling or unknown to us in 1969.

Membership? There is nothing astonishing or new concerning membership except that our predictions always turn out to be too low. In 1960, an official CEC study predicted that 1970 would see 30,000 members. In 1968, we are over 36,000 and undoubtedly will go over 45,000 by 1970. By 1980, we could have 60,000 members and perhaps 100,000 by the year 2000. No surprises there--only more members, more services, more dues.

2. My second premise against surprises in 2000 is that CEC is now a really big organization and its trends and members are a complex reality which will not be easily changed in any unusual direction. Institutional organizations like CEC are evolved and not revolutioned. CEC now has established a committee of distinguished CEC'ers who are committed to fashioning a plan of long term goals for the Council. Will their plans and objectives for the 1980's be very different from the present? How could they be, when our ideas are posited upon prior trends--or, as we would say it in the education of the deaf, the deaf child can only speak or lipread the words he already knows and that have become a known reality to him.

   CEC now has an Educational Policies Committee which seeks to write, and present for adoption by the Council, official positions on major topics in special education. Thus we may have, within a few years, statements on the place of the gifted in special education, or desirable administrative patterns, or a rationale for effective financing at the local, intermediate, and national levels. These Council activities seek to insure evolution and to avoid the need for revolution.

3. Thirdly, CEC is a social organization of professionals dedicated to a service function. It is unlikely that many or all of the ingredients in this type of "soup" will change radically within the next 30 years. Handicapped and gifted children--these you will always have with you! Teachers, supervisors, administrators, and researchers--they may be renamed educationists or clinicals or prescriptors or diagnosticians or team members or programers or the machine, but somehow all of them will survive.

   However, you exclaim, the trends today are too strong to be resisted. We will eventually have machines that teach, educational consoles for each home, resource centers instead of schools, and chemicals that sharpen memory and improve learning; we might even have, by the year 2000, prenatal determination of genes and characteristics of intelligence. My response here is in two parts: First, Human beings tend to resist, obstruct, and reverse trends that are costly, uncomfortable, or innovative. Thus, I believe that not all of the potential easy answer miracles will solve our gritty problems. The kind of education a deaf child receives may be different, but the deaf child will be there in 2000 A.D. and so will our desires to do the job better than before. Second, in recent history for every step forward in ex-

ploring and controlling life processes, there seems to have been a corresponding residue of side effects or handicapping conditions. One example: for the benefits of the antibiotic drugs, we have paid the price of a greater incidence of living, damaged youngsters with perceptual and communicative problems.

For CEC in 2000 A.D., I predict a Canadian CEC and a United States CEC which will stand forth as separate entities, bigger than ever and more influential; a few extra journals; expanded staff and services; extensive consultative activities; regional offices in the Northeast, Northwest, Southeast, Southwest, central states, and perhaps Mars; divisions and sections of the Council to serve whatever the groups of handicapped and gifted children are called in those days; research studies and demonstration projects concerned with administrative problems, new classifications, and the preparation of personnel; and perhaps even a computer taught course piped into every college and university in the country on the education of the exceptional child.

Special Education

At this point, I want to turn from CEC in particular and discuss the present and future of special education in general. The major conclusion that one reaches when one tries seriously and at length to evaluate, to predict, and possibly to control the future, is the overriding lesson that it is impossible to entirely understand future patterns and to voice the long term consequences of alternative policies. Thus, humans usually fall back on their native conservatism and try to moderate headlong trends--they seek to decrease reliance upon unknown factors beyond their control. As Kahn and Weiner (1967) put it,

> What is necessary is an unfailing respect for the world as we find it and for dissent and diversity, even for ornery individual stubbornness . . . above all, there must be a concern for perpetuating those institutions that protect freedom of human choice (p. 413).

Five credos make up my consideration of the year 2000 for special education. Where some of us think "unthinkable thoughts" and others desire "reevaluations" and "revolutions," I have these beliefs that might enliven and perhaps ennoble the years that lie ahead.

Credo #1: Special education has need of philosophers and scholars who are interested in explaining the self or "esse" of special education. Why do we exist and why are we what we are in our professional endeavors? The definition of special education most often given is the familiar phrase about accepting children unable to fit into the regular school program. This is a negative and self defeating set of concepts which should be buried in oblivion and replaced by universally held action objectives. Not "What is special about special education?" is a worthy question that could save us many a false step into the learning disabilities or the field of the culturally deprived or the trainable areas-if these are really false steps. Under the present concept, we have no right to reject or rule out anything from special education's orbit of endeavors. Even more limiting, we do not know who we are. Thus, the first objective is to stimulate and stretch the imagination of special educators and improve our perspective about ourselves. To paraphrase Joseph Krutch (1968), "The quality of life in whatever special education is--that is precisely what seems to be almost entirely left out of consideration in many prophecies (p. 14)."

Credo #2: Special education must be studied, evaluated, and conceptualized as a totality--as a major entity--as a unifying concept. By and large, special education and the special educators at the university levels in particular have been content with the advancement in knowledge which comes with the advancement

in knowledge which comes from the processing of small pieces of information. Special educators have not been ambitious enough to study special education as a totality. How many scholars can you name who have studied or written about special education as a subject? At the present it seems that we fear to deal with the complexity of special education; because of the lack of a complex vocabulary, we are not capable of making the complex inferences, we do not possess the complex instruments of analysis and evaluation, and we are afraid of dealing with the necessarily complex predictions. As has been said rather aptly, "We are using salt spoons to clear away snow drifts and reading glasses to study the structures of molecules (Krutch, 1968, p. 14)."

Credo #3: Our major endeavor in the exploration of special education's future should be to clarify, define, expound, and argue major issues. The argument aspect of major issues we do rather well; when it comes to definitions and clarifications about issues, we act in a different fashion. For example, can you name the ten most critical, current issues in special education? I didn't say name ten current trends, but issues! For example, learning disabilities! Is it a trend or an issue? If it's an issue, why is it so? Can you define this subject, define its problem aspects, define its history and relationships, define its direct effects and its future implications? When you do all that for the learning disabilities, you are beginning to clarify one major issue in the field of special education. When you have convinced a significant group of CEC'ers and public power groups that your analysis makes some sense, then you are beginning to achieve my third credo for charting the future course of special education.

Credo #4: Special education must clarify currently realistic policy choices, and improve the ability of policy makers to react to the unfamiliar or the difficult. In administrative circles several years ago, one of the central themes of the administrative process was decision making by the leaders no matter whether their titles were supervisor, chairman, professor, principal, or superintendent. There was much speculation that when a mature human being was capable of sorting through a maze of details to arrive at an answer that sounded sensible to the majority of the faculty, board, parents, and public, then that individual had the central skill of an effective administrator. There was a lot of truth in that proposition. For special education enterprises, be they research, curriculum, college teaching, or state leadership, the key person sitting in the center of most things remains the boss or head of that particular program. The basic question of how we get better administrators in special education has not had its surface scratched.

A popular type of seminar game in university administration courses is to outline the personality and management characteristics of the leadership that may be required in the twenty-first century. Thus, we have the man, the job, and the setting analyses which add up to the need for a special education enterprise to serve exceptional children and to provide community satisfactions. Another model creates the image of management which has a minimum of restraints and a maximum of acceptance of its objectives by the people within it. Another fashionable method of expressing the concern for future leadership is to describe the younger, critical generation members as disruptive, irreverent, and rebellious, and then to state that they must not be alienated for their behaviors but should be absorbed into the organization by some wave of a magic wand.

It remains a truism that leadership plays a key role in any social enterprise, including special education. But the production of creative, responsible, and effective leaders is as great a mystery in 1968 as it was in 1928 or, indeed, might remain in 1998. Were we in special education to solve the problem of how to produce superior leadership for our enterprises, then we might well be on the road to vastly different programs by 2000 A.D.

May I present a public plea to the Office of Education, to the state department of education, and to the universities to work out some better ways of producing special education administrators? Every teacher will thank you for a generation to come--and beyond 2000 A.D.--if you but give to each local district and residential school a special education administrator who can clarify realistic policy choices and improve his or her ability to react to the unfamiliar and the difficult.

Credo #5: We must generate and document conclusions, recommendations, and desirable trends. In special education we now have our state plans, our Title I projects, our research reports (with abstracts), our Title III evaluations, our self study recommendations, our teacher checklists, and our graduate students' ratings of professors. The Western World has turned from a race of pioneers and rugged individualists into nations of committeemen, pen pushers, computers, and publish conscious egotists. The future danger for special education is that committee reports will become museum pieces and that desirable trends will wither by the wayside because no one knows how to jump on a bandwagon. An example to the point lies in a publication like the Professional Standards for Personnel in the Education of Exceptional Children (The Council for Exceptional Children, 1966). After three long hard years of effort by distinguished committees and critical conferences, this compilation of desirable trends and recommended standards has yet to be applied in any serious way by the overwhelming majority of special educators. By 2000 A.D., it could be in its seventh revision and still be unused by state certification agencies, colleges, and universities or by national accrediting bodies.

Another approach to the problems of the future in special education is to say that one overall psychology or meaning should be accepted for the reality around us and that the future must be visualized in its terms only. The inherent danger here is the acceptance of only one description of the future and the failure to allow a range of more generalized goals. Our model should rather be the psychiatrist who does not allow himself to see the world through the eyes of his patient, but keeps his own professional analysis on a different plane of scrutiny, feedback, and reevaluation. A most contemporary example of accepting premises and then being caught up in their consequences is the current discussion regarding "the chemistry of learning." Under this approach educators are promised "enzyme assisted instruction, protein memory consolidators, and antibiotic memory repellers (Krutch, 1968, p. 14)." Thus, teachers need no longer worry about becoming computers; we are all going to be turned into pharmacists.

I would submit to you that most past advances in the social sciences have come from the hands of practitioners rather than from the conclusions of researchers. The worlds of reflection and of action cannot, in reality, be divided, but unfortunately a dichotomy has sprung up. University instructors must not "communicate to their students a moral snobbism toward those who live with the ethical dilemmas of responsible action." Neither must the actionists among us resent and repell the scholar, the critic, the writer, or the rationalist.

Special education has urgent need of its scholars and its poets. Perhaps some of you will say that we now have greater need for them than for executives. But, in the long run, it will be the administrators and the teachers who must put special education into effect, who must turn theory into practice and make of today's exceptional children the better, mature citizens of tomorrow. If we cannot look forward in 2000 A.D. toward improving our pupils' educational achievement, then there will not be much use in our working so hard, or much satisfaction and fun in trying.

The worst that can be said about special education is that most of its practitioners and researchers have never wondered about its future. We are so proud

of our pragmatic stance, of our growth curve, of our grants and titles, and we are so busy tearing down present classifications or putting our names on articles and studies, that we don't even wonder how it will all turn out. In many ways, special education lacks an adequate vision of its future. And yet, as a social science and as social scientists, we must be aware that we are a part of the system which should be studied. As participants and observers we are analyzing and creating the world in which we must work. Our knowledge of the special education field will change that work as we know it better, as we examine it more efficiently, and as we examine it from new directions. As a field of study we must delineate the value system in special education. The resulting ethical and moral standards should make us take our work more seriously in achieving a stable niche in the framework of the future of our social system.

Special education must gain political and economic power which fits the governmental structure of our present and future times. If special education is to endure, it must be flexibly contemporary, not only in our own journals but in the vocabulary and thoughts of the community; it must relate to every strata of the Great Society and the political and social trends of the future governmental regimes.

I hope that this wondering about special education's future will be spiced liberally with the tangy tastes of power, influence, values, and unorthodox opinions. It may be true that there is nothing stronger than an idea which has reached its time, but it is also true that there is nothing deader than an idea which is still around after its time.

Within this article will be found a variety of procedures to wring out from the year 2000 A.D. some of its secrets. Yet little specific can be expected. Rather, facts and trends can be displayed to explore the possibilities inherent in tendencies present in contemporary special education. Some trends can be reversed or distracted just as the economist does not try to control business growth but rather to curb depressions and inflationary periods. Special education likewise cannot aspire to control the future but rather to curb its negative excesses and encourage its positive movements.

My Predictions

And so, we finally come to my predictions about the year 2000 A.D. What kind of a world will it be? And what will these predictions mean for special education?

1. I predict that the world of 2000 A.D. will look much like ours in 1968 because, no matter what technological changes will be made, the human beings who inhabit this planet are far too complex and the western world too socially stable to change radically. Many specifics of our coming lifetime may be unusual or altered, but the basic human problems will remain: where to live, what to eat, the struggle for suitable living standards, the shifting of political institutional aims, and the betterment of health.

2. The world of 2000 A.D. will have forced us all to live closer together while we move around more, to work cooperatively on common problems and at the same time to carve out for each individual his private niches of pride, interests, and achievements.

3. The world of 2000 A.D. will intensify the centralization of governmental support and programs to the point that individuals and local groups working for a common purpose will find it necessary to ally themselves with countrywide organizations in order to reach their objectives and adequately share in the national resources.

4. The world of 2000 A.D. will witness the increasing power of mankind to control his physical environment, while the complexity of social interactions will make us increasingly uneasy as we struggle to understand the responsibilities and the control of these advances.

5. The world of 2000 A.D. will appear even more a world of the young in spirit, and, while its pace and complexities may be accelerated, the greater knowledge and broader human endeavors will force the serious minded to spend longer periods in study, reflection, and research.

For special education, all of this should add up to a greater struggle for mastery of its own world--but with more effective weapons, greater satisfactions, more tangible gains, better instruction, more effective evaluations, tighter teamwork, saner diagnoses, perceptive teachers, insightful supervisors, decisive administrators, revolutionizing researchers, and exhilarating professors. Literally, I mean that the seeding and the tilling will be more difficult but the harvesting should be more bountiful and satisfactory.

Whether the future of special education changes most because of research or chemistry or technology or methodology or teachers' insights, it is bound to change radically in its outward garb. Perhaps in three ways the special education of 2000 A.D. will look different:

1. The special education classroom will probably resemble the language laboratories of today. Desk consoles, study carrels, screens, and buttons--these individualized teaching learning materials will crowd our rooms the way blackboards, desks, and windows do in the schoolrooms of 1968.

2. The teacher's words, movements, and planning of 2000 A.D. will be more and more directed toward the individual child. The class members may be scattered around the school and many of them may be at home or in a hospital. Teacher pupil rapport will be as firm as in 1968, but perhaps will not occur in the physical proximity of the same room.

3. A significant group of special educators at the local, state, and national levels will be preparing materials for future use in classrooms with handicapped pupils or in college instructional areas for prospective teachers. This educational activity of 2000 A.D. will be the logical extension of our 1968 ERIC and programing work. But instead of being a part time or incidental outgrowth of teacher made materials, the preparation of the software will be recognized as vital, full time, and basic to any curriculum or instructional enterprise. As much as 20 to 30 percent of a local district's budget will be spent on personnel endeavors to give the master teacher an array of programed materials and assistants that can extend his or her master skills to many times the number of handicapped pupils currently served by one teacher.

In several ways also the special education teacher may be different. Tapes, screens, records, and other technological devices, together with the computer, will make possible a variety of instructional approaches using unique sight, sound, and touch possibilities. The teacher, therefore, for 50 percent of the child's school day or week, may be a computer and not a human being. On the same theme, the person who is a teacher will have absorbed in a center of teacher education such courses or knowledge as computer math, programing, systems design, cybernation, drug therapy, and the sociology of leisure.

Another difference in the world of 2000 A.D. will present the teacher as the leader of a team of specialists. Around each master taacher will cluster several programers, a curriculum technician or two, a learning psychologist, a language specialist, two or three assistant or junior teachers, three or four vo-

lunteers to take individual pupils on trips or to care for their physical and emotional needs, a videotape crew to record daily learning happenings, and a planner to lay out the next day's and next week's programs for pupils and team members.

All of this "stuff" of the year 2000 A.D. will not change the basic ingredients of teacher learner but it will actualize the two basic objectives of the school process even more effectively; First, it will bring the energy and ingenuity of a specialized group of people directly into focus upon that irreducible unit of one learner and a teacher, human or nonhuman, and, secondly, it will complicate the preparation programs of teachers to an unlimited degree and make a few master teachers (on our Ph.D. level of today) the effective and widely influential leaders who might be responsible for hundreds of pupils at once in many localities.

Conclusion

In whatever words we say it, the conclusion on this topic must be the same: "The future is what you make of it." Kahn and Wiener (1967) phrase it this way:

> Of course, it will be worthwhile to try to improve our understanding of future possibilities and the long term consequences of alternative policies. But the problem is ultimately too difficult, and these efforts can never be entirely successful. . . (thus) there must be a certain for perpetuating those institutions that protect freedom of human choice--not only for today's individuals. . . but for those who will follow us (p. 413).

The future of special education should be a bright one as we can see it now. The recent stimulation of federal leadership through its varied programs, the technological explosion, and the increased financial resources available to our field all portend increased productivity and diversity of professional efforts. Effective programs have a way of surviving over the decades; surface rooted trends usually evaporate after a few years' exposure.

With our hopes high and our faith based on the foundation of past exploits for the exceptional child, special education looks toward the year 2000 A.D. and says, "Let it come!"

References

Connor, L. Reflections on the year 2000. Exceptional Children, 1968, 34, 725-732.

The Council for Exceptional Children. CEC professional standards for personnel in the education of exceptional children. Washington: CEC, 1966.

Kahn H., and Weiner, A. J. The year 2000. New York· Macmillan, 1967.

Krutch, J. W. What the year 2000 won't be like. Saturday review of Literature, 1968, 51, 12-14.

PRESIDENT'S DINNER ADDRESS

by

Jacob Javits

Thank you very much Dr. Connor, for your gracious introduction, and thank

you ladies and gentlemen, for your warm reception which I appreciate both for myself and for Roy Millenson--my right arm--who, as a legislative assistant, has for many years been concerned with the varied problems to which Dr. Connor referred.

I would like to pay my respects to Msor. Dulin, Rev. Young, Dr. Kidd, your president elect, to Ray Simches, who is Director of the Bureau for the Physically handicapped of the New York State Department of Education, and to Dr. Helen Donovan, here for New York.

I have a deep feeling for the work you do, and before launching to the formal part of my address, I would like to talk for a minute about the privilege given me by Dr.Leo Connor of speaking at the commencement of the Lexington School for the Deaf. I've rarely in my life been so moved. First, I spoke, and the children who were deaf listened, and they understood. I am an experienced speaker, and I can feel when an audience is understanding and following every word, with not only the ability to comprehend it, but with the ability to feel and understand it. Then, one of the deaf children made the valedictory speech. The labor it took to teach a child who cannot hear sound to speak so articulately and so feelingly impressed me greatly. I do not tell you this to inspire wonder or amazement--you certainly know it all much better than I do--but to emphasize what you mean to our time. It is a time of great danger. It is a time of great destruction, not only of life and property, but of values. We don't know yet which way the world will go. We are religious and, therefore, we believe that it will have a living destiny of happiness, but there is no assurance of it so far in the affairs of mankind or in the relations between nations, or in the ability of the rule of law to overtake the rule of force. And so, it is a dangerous world. But at the same time, this is also a tremendously developing, expanding, and unfolding world, and perhaps you yourselves do not realize the part you play in it. Aside from adventures in science, technology, space, and in health, housing, and education, and in almost every other field, there is a tremendous expansion of the willingness of individuals to devote themselves to the mining of the human personality--which is what you are doing--in order to make life more fruitful, more beautiful, and more productive. You are mining veins of the human personality which were neglected completely for thousands of years. This, to me, is the miracle that is epitmomized by your profession.

You know, we work hard in the Congress. Our distinguished committee counsel Jack Forsythe, and his wife, Pat, are here, and are deeply dedicated to the things you do. He has the top position with the majority on our Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and is of indispensible help to you. They can tell you that we work very hard, but we too often miss the forest for the trees until we actually look into the faces of some of the people whom you are animating and to whom you are giving tools for self development, and until we see the expanding horizons of those people whom we will establish as productive and useful citizens.

You said, Dr. Connor, that I am the Republican friend of CEC. You also have a great Democratic friend--our chairman, Senator Hill, who has dedicated his life to the advancement and enlargement of the opportunities for this kind of education, and you have other friends on the committee--Senator Morse, Senator Yarborough, Senator Clark, and both Kennadys. In our committee, there is a great devotion on both sides of the aisle. We may differ about means, but never about objectives or about dedication to the purpose for which we act. I know I represent every one of my collegues in telling you that we do understand, that we do appreciate, and that we are sensitive to the degree of your dedication and to the results of your mission, for which we have had the privilege of giving you some of the tools which represent the opportunity for you to do even more.

Health Crisis

Although I have to get back to Washington tonight, and do not wish to trespass unduly on your time, I want to talk with you about something that concerns all of us: the great crisis which we face on the economic aspects of health. Unfortunately, the people who are bearing the burden of the health crisis are those who can afford it least--the poor in our central cities and in remote rural areas.

Even worse, one-third of our nation's hospital capacity is outmoded and obsolete. This not only impairs the quality of care, but adds to rapidly accelerating health costs, limits medical education and hospital centered research, and affects the supply of needed personnel. We are told by a survey conducted by the Columbia School of Public Health that 43 percent of our 5,200 general hospitals provide care that is only "poor to fair." For the State of New York, the Associate Commissioner of Health of the State Department of Health, says that three fourths of New York City's municipal hospitals are obsolete. Only 17 percent of New York's hospitals would probably pass the public health standards on fire protection.

In addition, we have a national shortage of 50,000 physicians, and 5,000 American communities have no doctor at all. Not only do we have a deficiency in the number of physicians, but the proportion of family physicians and dentists in relation to the population is declining. This shortage even affects states with a high proportion of physicians, for example, New York and Massachusetts, which have 200 doctors for every 100,000 people. But even in physician prosperous New York, there is a tremendous paucity in the rural and in the ghetto areas; that is why we are doing our utmost to give certain special benefits to attract doctors who will move into those areas.

Also--and here I speak from the vantage point of membership on the Joint Economic Committee--one of the big aspects of inflation and the increase in the cost of living is health services costs, which are rising twice as fast as the cost of living, and which add to the difficulties caused by shortages of personnel and by inadequate facilities.

The problem really has been that our national priorities are not adjusted to this situation, and, hence, the tendency has been to put off ending solutions to the problem. For instance, in 1966, in his health message to the Congress, the President said that one third of the nation's hospital capacity is obsolete and he asked us for a ten year, $10 billion program to deal with this urgent need.

When Congress failed to act on the Administration's bill, the President in his 1967 Health Message indicated he was appointing a National Advisory Commission on Health Facilities to study the issue and make recommendations. And this year, in his 1968 Health Message to the Congress, the President was silent on the subject. In three years the nation went from a call for major action, to a request for a study, to silence.

But that isn't all. For the current year, Congress appropriated $280 million for the Hill-Burton Act, which includes hospital modernization as well as new construction. But, the President's budget submitted in January reveals a requested cut of $26 million in even this amount. So, we degenerate still further --from silence, to cutting back on the inadequate efforts we are making.

Time may well be a healer but time will not heal outmoded hospital facilities nor cure mounting costs. Inaction, delays, and repetitive surveys must not be our reaction to the health crisis. Delays are costly. For example, each year we delay filling the $1 billion annual need in hospital modernization, rising construction costs add another $70 million to the bill, a charge which is eventually passed on to hospital users and local and Federal taxpayers. And each year of delay means that some American is short changed on health care.

At the Federal level, I am pressing for Congressional approval of my own bill, the Hospital Modernization and Improvement Act, which, at a relatively modest $49 million annual cost, will provide needed hospital modernization and also the development of new techniques in hospital procedures and construction. The idea is to use the resources of the private enterprise system by making available Federal guarantees of up to 90 percent for loans for hospital modernization and to provide Federal payments of interest charges above 2 percent. This loan guarantee, interest subsidy plan is the key to moving forward in providing health services regardless of the other demands of the Federal Government.

Health Personnel

In his March 4th Health Message to the Congress, the President noted the critical shortage of health personnel.

At the non government level, the American Association of Medical Colleges reports that "every academic medical center in the United States is in trouble financially, and some are in desperate straits." Already, two Midwestern medical schools have notified the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that they are going to close, and we understand that a third one is also in some difficulty.

There is a good deal of legislation already on statute books to deal with this problem. The difficulty is that it is not being implemented with money. Congress now has before it the Health Manpower Act, an excellent bill to strengthen and extend these programs, but again, the difficulty is money. For example, for the current fiscal year, the Administration is leaving unspent one third ($67 million) of the $203 million appropriated by Congress for health teaching facilities. Health manpower programs are faced with a 26 percent budget cut; $382.7 million was appropriated for this year and the fiscal year 1969 request is $282.4 million. As part of this cut construction of health educational facilities is cut back 58 percent.

Now, I realize that these cuts in health education are being matched by those elsewhere in education. For example, in the educational field, some budget requests are less than 50 percent of the amount which is authorized. For the current fiscal year, $154, million was authorized for Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act but $15 million was all that was appropriated for the handicapped. Appropriating only ten percent of the authorization is a shocking situation, and indeed the administration is not even going to spend all of the $15 million.

We cannot meet present and future medical care needs while there are such serious shortages of facilities and personnel by hiding behind the thickness of the national budget. Inadequate colleges and insufficient enrollments today mean that we will be short of doctors, nurses, and other health professionals tomorrow; just as postponement of essential health hospital modernization and construction will result in more shortages and will cost more money because of the increase in costs. Should the increased expenditures necessary to safeguard the nation's health require additional taxation and cutbacks in other less essential categories, such as public works, or space, or some of the defense budget not related to the Viet Nam war; then we must go ahead with it; we must also be prepared to tax ourselves.

One other thing we should remember is that the potential for support of what we are doing through private and coorperate giving is not being fully realized. Probably not better than one fifth or one sixth of the amount which individuals and corporations can deduct from their income taxes an in making voluntary contributions is being utilized in that way. This affords an enormous theatre for the activities of those who manage the institutions in which many of you

work.

The task is not entirely one for the Federal Government. The states also have a key role. I have been trying to encourage the states to fill that role by providing federal matching funds for increases in state programs so states will be motivated to broaden their existing programs and to inaugurate new ones. Federal health manpower efforts must be keyed to local and state efforts so as to maximize their effectiveness.

Emphasizing the importance of local responsibility is also necessary in order to affect the situation of nurses in this country. The Lent Report states that the "single most important health problem in New York State and the nation is how to increase the number of professional registered nurses." Or, as Surgeon General William Stewart put it so succinctly: "Our nurses are undermanned." Yet, nurses receive on the average a little over $5,200 annually which compares unfavorably with the average factory worker's wage of $5,975 a year. It has been said of the nurse that "she must feel like a girl, act like a lady, think like a man, and work like a dog." Let us add to that, "and be paid like a member of an honored and skilled profession."

So our work, those of us in the Congress and those of us in the rest of the country, is cut out for us if we are to do the things which need to be done in order to meet our responsibility to the people of this nation.

Modernization

A great deal can be done to modernize every aspect of the nation's health care through science, technology, and research. This does not mean that hospitals have to be run the same way that they are today, or that every hospital has to have the complete equipment in many cases that it seeks to have today as if there were no other institution upon which it could lean and with which it could coordinate. There are unbelievable possibilities in the pooling of services, the pooling of facilities, and in the establishment of greater efficiency and management in operation. Indeed, this kind of cooperation is one way in which the problem can be approached rather than by relying solely upon the more expensive and painful way of increasing our expenditures and trying to find the money from contributions or from the government.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we must realize that this is an age of crises. I have spoken of the health crisis. But it is also an age in which the means by which we can meet crises was never greater and in which the resources which mankind is ready to devote to the solution of crises is at nearly the highest peak that it has ever been.

As a public official, I hear time and time again that we are getting rooted in error, that it is very difficult and frustrating to move and to change, and that the opportunities for the individual are deadened and frustrated by the size and complexity of our society. With all respect to that opinion, I cannot agree. We are still a young, a vital, and a vigorous nation. There may be a different frame of reference for the kinds of actions we can take toward self-improvement and the improvement of the conditions of others in our society, but there are many persons, such as yourselves, whose ideas and dedication have made enormous contributions toward the vitality of this nation, which is characterized by your work. We must remember that we are young; our whole society is young. We still remain the hope of mankind and ours is still the revolution that inspires the rest of the world.

HOW SPECIAL CAN SPECIAL EDUCATION BECOME?

by

Elizabeth Koontz

Introduction

Thank you Dr. Willenburg. Perhaps more than feeling honored at addressing this assembly, I am pleased to be able to attend the national convention of the Council for Exceptional Children, and I am especially happy to see one of my former instructors, Dr. Mildred Turner Barksdale.

It would seem from the daily news in most of the papers that this whole country considers education to be vitally important and to be one of its priorities. However, not all of the country looks upon education as a priority, simply because of what must be contributed to its support, but there are those who make it a priority because of their opposition to the teacher unrest. I am not unhappy with teacher unrest and increased militancy. I think it is a healthy sign that teachers are still concerned about what happens to education of children and adults.

However, this concern is like all other good purposes. It, too, is often accompanied by elements that we wish were not present, but which must be seen in perspective. If there is any single thing that special educators must do, it is to keep before this nation the importance of education for all children.

As everyone has also heard in the news and seen on television, bond issues and referendums, efforts to change, are being voted down by communities. So, one cannot be sure that this nation really places a high value on education generally. Those who consider education very important have to stop and wonder what the course should be, what the direction is, and what the focus should be.

Each of us has probably had his turn considering giving up work in this special area of education. Certainly, the amount of training and skill that you possess is needed in many, many other fields. There are, no doubt, many offers made to you because of your knowledge of human nature, offers to leave your post and your specialty to go into some other channel; but somehow most of us seem to come back to the realization that these children need us.

I recall that when I was on leave as President of the NEA Department of Classroom Teachers, one of my big concerns was what would happen to my students. I just knew that they were going to suffer miserably! I knew that they wouldn't learn a single thing, and as a matter of fact, that they would likely regress! But when I visited the school and saw my children coming down the hallway from Assembly, only one person casually turned and gave a feeble little wave. No one was in tears; nobody broke out and ran to me to tell me how unhappy he was or how mistreated he felt, or how his education had suffered!

So I faced one of the truths: when children have good teachers, the individual himself does not matter so much if the personality, the concern, and the caring about the children as individuals are there. This is wonderful; sometimes we get wrapped up in thinking of education as OURS and fail to remember that education is for the students.

It took me quite a number of years to face my moment of truth that what I must be prepared to offer students is a good teacher whenever I am away so that their education is not interrupted.

I mention this because I think all of us need a good look at where we've been, at where we are, and where we might be going. For every state, school district,county, or region we can count, there have been notices saying that we've done fairly well in this business of education. But sometimes these very words are in indictment. They imply that because we've done well, we don't need anything more in order to keep doing well. This willingness to try to do well inspite of the odds has militated against us in our efforts to gain increased support of education. The idea that "all a good teacher needs to teach these children is a warm body, some play things, and dedication," and the idea that we all have that "superman element" or that "motherly instinct" that can always be counted on are ideas not appreciated by special educators. Those who are trained in the work know that teachers cannot simply "mother" children, cannot be simply "dedicated women or men." That image is changing, as we realize when we assess where we have been, who we are, and where we are going.

It is for this reason that I have selected the topic, "How Special Can Special Education Become?" Think of your own system, whether you are in the field of services provided by a locality, by a state, or by a federal government, whether you are in the private or public sector, whether you are employed or a volunteer, whether you are a director, a teacher, a specialist, an aide, or whether you are in the educational arena or the medical--no matter what your specialty might be, just think for a few minutes about how special special education can become.

History of Special Education

In the past, very little attention was given to the handicapped. Those who could afford it put the child into a nursing home, far away from the family where nobody would know. We now sometimes speak of this period as the dark ages. Sometimes there were those who were gifted and "just a little bit queer," people said, and they were often estranged from society because of their unusual insight into a world that was not yet commonplace.

I often think of the dark ages described in the book, "The Snake Pit," as a classic example of how far we have come, and yet, behind our private doors, there are still "snake pits," that do not allow children who can learn an opportunity to do so. As one searches history on the care of the handicapped, he is likely to be surprised at how long these conditions have prevailed even in some enlightened communities. And if one reads about any section of the country, he will find in sections of states some absolute horror stories about present day treatment of physical and mental defects. If one visits schools across the nation, he will find even today conditions that resemble the dark ages.

What does this mean to special educators? It seems to indicate that the evidence, the research data, the medical research now being undertaken, and the predictions being made are not reaching the public; they are not reaching those who can affect the future.

There are many, many breakthroughs: breakthroughs of new and early treatments (such as preventive measures that will decrease birth defects), on the advantages of an adequate diet, and on the advantages of conducive environment. These should be welcomed, but unfortunately, these breakthroughs and the data available are not enough. Those in special education now must be engaged actively in the problems of special education. This involvement means bringing into awareness those who are teaching in special education but who seem to feel on the outside of this area of responsible action.

The Educational Rights of Exceptional Children.

There are many premises upon which our educational system is founded, and

it has been proudly and glibly said, "We believe that every child is entitled to educational opportunity to the extent of his ability; that's what American education is". But what we really meant was that every child and youth who lived where a community was willing to pay for the support of education had this right. We also meant that children and youth who could fit into that mold we call the school had this right, we meant that the "normal child" had this right. But the real meaning of the words has never been felt. We are on the threshold of actually making that philosophy of education come true, but until we stop determining a child's right to an education by his ability to measure up on an I Q test, we really want to be able to say that the schools are there for children to learn to the extend of their abilities.

In an overview of our good philosophy that we never really meant, however, something did happen. Several states began to take an interest and to invest in the education of the handicapped. The federal government became visible, and other states soon decided that if some leading states were supporting innovations in education, then they too should become involved. As a result, there was more wide spread support of education for the handicapped. Probably, none of this would have happened had there not been parents who insisted that their taxes for public education should pay for education of their own children, who might deviate from the normal. More important than this was the fact that parents were willing to bring their mentally retarded and physically handicapped children out into the light, unashamed. They would probably not have done this had there not been scientific research and knowledge about the cause of these disorders and the elimination of the myths surrounding the causes. All of these helped turn the attention of the public toward the problem of providing education so that more of these persons could become productive citizens.

You who are concerned with special education can recall the blind man who caned chairs, or the blind woman who wove rugs, or the town nit wit whom everyone excused and whom everyone helped. In a sense, I suppose people generally were kind because they were glad that they did not suffer these handicaps. But later, we found that there were many handicapped people who did not want or like pity, who wanted help, and the opportunity to contribute. So today this nation seems committed to providing an opportunity for those who suffer handicaps.

Involvement of Educators

On the other hand, I must remind you that the Congress of the United States authorized 51 million dollars to various agencies in support of the handicapped but only $2.5 million was appropriated. I wonder what happened to the rest of that authorization. One thing is certain, the staff of CEC cannot get that money, unless the Congress authorizes and appropriates it. And so, I must ask you: If it was not necessary to get an authorization and appropriation of 51 million dollars, why was it asked for in the first place? What kinds of opportunities would it supply? What kind of training would it enable us to achieve? If it was really important, you and I should have gone after it through our own Congressman, through our own legislators, through the kind of pressure that we know can be applied inspite of many other priorities. I mention this because, as long as we continue to hope that those who represent us will be able to work miracles, we shall not achieve our goal. Each of us must participate; this is the active involvement of which I spoke.

The handicapped must be trained, the gifted must have opportunities, the medical care must be provided, and most of all, there must be employment after training. But these are still the problems that will live with us until we apply our knowledge of know how, and until more cooperative ventures of medical science find ways of preventing retardation and of effecting various cures, As science finds ways of dealing with ancient problems, you and I are very much aware today that we must consider new kinds of problems, such as, damage from the

use of drugs. Thus, before we can even successfully concentrate on a curriculum, on materials, on tried and proven techniques in the training of those whom we call special, with certain disorders we are faced with a multiplicity of problems ranging from teacher supply to conservative response about what schools should be. Ours must be an unrelenting effort or else we shall find ourselves in the position we were in in the 19th century. All the research in the world will not make a difference unless we accept the responsibility of keeping those who are responsible for the decisions sensitive to the needs; unless we continue to accept as our special responsibility insuring that this nation fulfills its promise that every child and youth is entitled to an education to the extent of his ability. Then, this nation will deem the training of all of its people education, and the training will be suited to the needs of its people, not simply to those who can fit into the mold, or who cause the least trouble. Then we will have education that all of the people will be able to use. We will then be able to provide for those who are disadvantaged by cultural exclusion, by poverty, by health, by region, by national origin or by religion, and by education that was not suited to the individual. Then, our education will be special because we will once again recognize that all children are different, that they have problems that are different, and that most of all, they are individuals from different backgrounds with different needs and with some basic and common desires.

We know that nutrition is a basic factor now. We know that the nutrition of young children between the age of 3 and 4 can determine to some extinct what kind of operation their minds will be able to master. We know that methods of teaching, different techniques, and different materials can make a difference with children. We know that this nation holds no monopoly on the best of techniques, that even Yugulslavia has something that it can offer us in the teaching of the deaf and the partially hearing.

As we learn these new techniques, methods, and uses of materials, they will do little good unless they are made available to the children. So, for that reason there must be teachers, specialists, diagnosticians, and clinicians of various types to direct the training of these persons; this is another job you and I have to do.

We must also provide teaching methods that will keep young people interested in school. At the end of the day, you are as tired as everybody else is; there are days when you feel completely drained; there are days when you feel like you can toss the students out of a window. You have the human feelings that any other teacher, any other worker, any other professional must have; but I maintain that one exhausted from doing a work that he loves gives a different attitude than one who is not doing a job to which he is dedicated. It will be our attitudes toward our work that will either encourage or discourage young people from entering the field. We have the responsibility to encourage every state to provide the training at the undergraduate level so that students may get an early start and not do as so many of you and I have been forced to do--complete work for a masters degree and then take the training in special education with no increase in salary. It must be possible in every state for young people to make a career of work in special education, there is another demand upon our time.

As we demand that states make this kind of training available, we must also demand that local school systems and total educational associations be alert and sensitive to special education as an integral part of the total educational program. Whether it takes place in a residential setting, in the bedroom of a home bound child, or in a public school facility, administrators must be allowed to think of special education as an exceptional addition to the educational program. This means that you and I must be alert to see that this sensitivity prevails. Already special education is an adjunct, or an after thought to the total education program, and it will remain so as long as you and I permit it. Let's

not let a single community or educational system forget that these children are entitled to their educations; no matter whether they are out of school for six weeks or a whole year, whether they are physically handicapped, emotionally disturbed, or gifted, let's point out features of the traditional educational institutions that prove to be deterrents to the child who wants to go to school, but has to give up because the school was built for the perfect. When new buildings are being constructed, why can't we suggest that some features be added, so that the handicapped can be a part of public education? It may be as simple as ramps; it may be as simple as low rails in the bathrooms, but let's take some responsibility so that no one can say that we should have said something beforehand.

We have another great task: to support the efforts that will permit the continuation of much needed research, so that we can seek the causes of, and the remedies and preventatives for, these special malfunctions, so that these handicaps need not occur. "How special can special education become?" It can become as special as the individual demands. New kinds of handicaps, new kinds of disorders, new kinds of needs for the individual differences among us must be the basis on which education will be determined. When this is done, special education will no longer simply be for children in special education but for every child because it will be designed for his individual needs. The price is entirely too great to continue to allow exceptional children to be left to live lives of dejection, uselessness, or destruction.

"How special can special education become?" Just as special as the treatment of diseases, the setting of bones, the transplant of corneas, or the separation of Simese twins. The education of those who suffer these defects, and disorders will determine whether or not they will be contributing citizens or recipients, and it will be their education and training which will, in the end, help to determine whether they will share in this nations affluence, and promise of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, or whether they will be the forgotten ones.

Conclusion

This nation owes its people the individuality of instruction, treatment, and care. Until that day when this nation cares as much about the education of all of its people as it does about its highways, its public buildings, and its moon shots, the education of those in need of special education will continue to be regarded as special.

So, let's remove this stigma of special education in the training of those who still reside in the twilight zone of public education. Let's take to the public and the power forces within our communities and states the cause of public education of the children without: the mentally deficient, the superior ones, the physically handicapped, the hopeless, who tomorrow may be helped by breakthroughs today. Our work is not finished with today's task. For as long as there remains the child or youth whose needs are not being met simply because he is exceptional, special education must be very special.

"How special can special education become?" It can be as special as we want to make it become, and indeed if this nation is to fulfill promise, it can be no less.

REFLECTIONS ON THE NEW EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

by

Francis Keppel

The most important thing technology has done for education is to make us

think about HOW students learn, as well as WHAT they learn. As recently as the early 1950's curriculum experts and publishers alike focused almost exclusively on what students should learn, and had little thought to how the material could best be presented. Lectures and texts were the order of the day. Movies, filmstrips and other aids were used occasionally for illustration and entertainment, but the teacher and the textbook were the unchallenged media of instruction.

The development of instructional technology has highlighted the fact that the use of audiovisual and automated media for presentation of material can often facilitate learning.

Special education has been instrumental in arousing public concern for children with learning disabilities, and in bringing public attention to the fact that learning is a very complex phenomenon. Educators generally are beginning to speak of the learner's "perceptual apparatus" and his "pattern of intellectual abilities." The idea that curriculum can and should be designed to fit the unique abilities of each student is taking hold.

Special Education is the branch of education which historically has been most concerned with the question of how learning takes place; it has also lived most closely with technology, since instruction for children with learing, vision, and physical handicaps is of course intimately related to various technological devices.

Teachers and Technology

Special Education teachers have always geared their instruction to the needs of individual students; ingenious gadgets, special workbooks, storybooks, and games abound in every classroom. Today, however, many teachers, including those of exceptional children, are afraid of a technological takeover; they fear that automated devices will diagnose learning problems, present instructional material, monitor students' progress, and decide when they are ready to move on to something else.

What, then, does instructional technology expect from teachers? We read that the teacher of the future will be a manager, a coordinator of an instructional system. He will no longer be the chief transmitter of knowledge in the classroom; his pedagogical duties, it is said, will be more diagnostic and descriptive.

This situation is not necessary to be resented. Educators are not in classrooms only to give instruction afterall; they are there also to relate the curriculum to personal experiences and current events, to help students learn how to communicate their knowledge and their questions, to inject a note of humor when the going gets rough, to encourage pride in achievement, to create an atmosphere where there is excitement in knowing. What teacher, for example, did not need to put aside preplanned lessons to share thoughts about the life and death of Dr. King? To have meaning, classroom instruction must be relevant to the world outside, and to maintain that relevance, it will be flexible; it must be responsive to unpredictable variables which are nearly impossible to program. In the words of Philip Jackson:

> Teaching is an opportunistic process . . . .
> Stray thougnts, sudden insights, meandering digressions,
> irrelevant asides, and other unpredicted events
> constantly ruffle the smoothness of the instructional
> dialogue. In most classrooms, as every teacher knows,
> the path of educational progress could be more
> easily traced by a butterfly than a bullet.

Teachers will never outlive their usefulness, even though they relinquish some of their instructional function. Teachers and other instructional media need not treat on one another's toes: each has a vital role to play in the educative process.

Sharing Resources

The relationship between technology and education today is still sullied by mutual misunderstanding and suspicion. If technology is going to fit the needs of education and not the other way around, it seems imperative that industry and education learn to work together more effectively.

I would like to propose five areas in which a creative pooling of resources is now required. These are: research and development, evaluation, reporting, distribution, and planned interchange of personnel.

1. Research and Development. Great strides have recently been made in achieving cooperation between public schools and university research programs. Universities are no longer confined to their own demonstration schools for curricular experimentation. But only in a few instances has industry played a significant part in these undertakings, and these have been cases where particularly complicated hardware has been involved. It seems to me that industry might play a significant role both in making and disseminating the findings from some of these programs by publishing and distributing reports, monographs, etc., and by conducting seminars or workshops to demonstrate new materials or techniques and helping to train teachers in their use. These things could be done either by representatives of the companies, or by some nonprofit agent, such as one of the Regional Educational Laboratories or Instructional Materials Centers, with financial support coming from the companies. In short, there are several ways in which industry and education can work together to do a better job of keeping teachers informed about new developments in instructional media and methods than they are now doing.

In Special Education, we are beginning to see alliances between commercial interests and special programs for exceptional children. A few partnerships have been built between private companies and schools for exceptional children: the company subsidizes development of materials in return for publication rights. Some companies are also seeking ways to work with private professional organizations in promoting new programs and materials.

Most liaisons which have been established are very new; the relationships are often tenuous. They may, however, create some guidelines for partnerships in which the capital, the design, and the production facilities of industry are joined with the needs, ideas and expertise of education.

2. Evaluation. It is unfair to expect industry to undertake rigorous testing of products if educators do not demand it. Educators are usually willing to accept enthusiasm from teachers and/or students as evidence of educational validity. Educators don't ask for a comparison with alternatives, even though the crucial question is this: for what purpose, and for whom is any given approach superior to others? Even if we have comparison studies such as those which have been done on programed materials, for example, the information is usually incomplete. We are told that 60 percent of the children learned 20 percent more material, or learned the material 20 percent faster. But we are not told WHICH 60 percent, or how their learning characteristics differed from those of the 40 percent minority. Such data are extremely rare, yet educators need it in order to know which students will benefit most from the new

product or technique.

If evaluation is going to become more rigorous, educators must not only demand it, but they must participate in it. Teachers and administrators must be willing to put up with the disruption in routine, questions from parents, and increased paper work which go hand in hand with experimental use of media and materials.

3. Reporting. Educators and representatives from industry must get together to outline a set of standards for reporting results of experimental programs. As a university and government administrator, I have experienced the frustrations of trying to evaluate and compare results on the basis of incomplete and sometimes misleading information. Now, as president of a commercial company, I am finding this problem equally vexing. Medicine and the sciences have far better defined guidelines for reporting results of experiments. Why not education?

4. Distribution. It is not hard to imagine a day when industry provides a wide variety of collaboratively produced materials and equipment making up "instructional systems" for schools and colleges to consider for purchase. Purchasing decisions will not be easy to make, and perhaps the time has come to recognize that the systematic training of those in education who decide on what to buy is a responsibility both of education and the education industry. Obviously collaboration in this area will not be easy for competitive private enterprise, nor will it be easy for educators who will have to have confidence in the detachment of an industry which has its own products to sell. Yet such collaboration does not seem to be to be beyond our ingenuity, especially if it can be accomplished through some nonprofit mechanism. Interest has already been expressed by some of the Office of Education Regional Laboratories and the Instructional Materials Centers for Special Education.

5. Planned Interchange of Personnel. This area is vital to increasing cooperation in the four areas of mutual concern already mentioned. The consultant or author relationship is essential and should be expanded. But it will not be enough by itself for what seems to be coming up in the way of educational materials and programs. Some type of leave of absence arrangement should be explored in which educators could serve full time in industry and industry representatives could serve in education. School systems might give educators the option of taking six months or a year off, perhaps once every five years, to work under the auspices of a private company, developing ideas for new media or techniques. Industry might also give engineers, ex-teachers, media experts and subject matter experts the option of spending six months or a year every five years in a school setting, to sharpen their perception of the teaching-learning process.

Private companies involved in the education industry have many ex-teachers and other school personnel in their ranks, but in most cases these are people who have left the teaching profession and the academic world. Although their services are vital, they do not take the place of educators who maintain their closeness to the classroom--a fact which educators stress, but which industry often fails to recognize.

Joint appointments are another possibility. They are commonplace in the sciences and medicine--why not in education?

These are the areas, then, in which I feel industry and education must work together if we are to evolve an educational technology which is a real instrument of social progress.

REACTIONS TO KEPPELL'S "REFLECTIONS ON THE NEW EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY"

by

Lloyd M. Dunn

Dr. Keppell has certainly set the stage for us. Where are we going in our field of special education which is concerned with children who are quite different? It seems that we are faced with an issue that involves "attitudes." Special educators are deeply committed to the individual child, and believe that every child is different. Thus some special educators cannot entertain the notion that standard sets of instructional materials or sequential lessons would be useful in teaching the kind of children with whom special education is concerned. Therefore, as a group, we find it difficult to entertain the notions that such instructional materials are necessary to move our field forward. However, we need to look at ourselves and our pupils before deciding to perpetuate this negative attitude. As for me, I have decided well programed instructional materials have a place in special education. I argue most strenuously that we must look toward educational technology if we are going to move ahead. Thus, I will address my reactions to Dr. Keppell's paper by looking at the "why?" "who?" and "how?"

Why?

Why? Why are standardized instructional materials needed in special education? There are a number of reasons. First, we must improve our teaching and this is one way to do it. The alternative is to expect each teacher to create an individualized, hand tailored program of instruction for each pupil. This is our ideal, but it is seldom attained. Unfortunately special education programs tend to be watered down regular courses of study. One way to make special education more special would be to have an array of standardized, specialized, instructional programs at our disposal. The task would be to select the needed specialized programs for a particular handicapped child, modify them as needed, and teach them well. Thus, these programs would be a library of specialized treatments, of which we are now quite bankrupt. Second, standardized and specialized materials allow the use of a wide array of people in teaching handicapped children, and yet allow teachers to do an adequate job. There is, and there will be, a critical shortage of master, creative teachers. Their creative talents must be used to devise specialized procedures so they may be applied by others. Thus, advances in educational technology, as Dr. Keppell has already said, will help alleviate the perennial shortage of top level professional teacher power.

Who?

To answer the question, "who?", some 15 to 20 percent of the most creative special educators need to be freed from classroom instruction to work at developing new instructional programs in a series of "instructional materials development centers", scattered across the country. These creative people must be found and given leaves of absence, as Dr. Keppell said, so they may be free to create, field test, and refine a variety of instructional materials. Perhaps the US Office of Education could stimulate such activity by supporting it out of Title VI of PL 89-10.

How?

Once the resources to free these creative special educators are found, "how" do we proceed? First, conceptual models must be evolved upon which to build programs. In this regard, the master teacher will need to join hands with the theoreticians, curriculum specialists, and other behavioral scientists in evolving schema which will be a first step in ordering programs. Topics which might be included, with teach of them requiring a breakdown, include:

1. motor development
2. sensory and perceptual training
3. cognitive and concept formation including language development
4. expressive language training
5. connative (personality) development
6. social interaction training
7. vocational training.

(Under cognitive development alone 50 to 100 training programs might be developed one or more for each of the aspects of intellect.)

Second, special educators need to be organized in groups depending on expertise. Here is an occasion when the team approach, if not the interdisciplinary team, would seem to be desirable. For example, in working up specialized programs in motor development, a team of special and physical educators, occupational and physical therapists, people in recreation, physical medicine, etc. would be needed.

As in the other topics, there is a need for much work in the area of sensory and perceptual training. Many pupils get stuck at this stage. Too often educators begin pushing academic subjects before the child has developed an adequate foundation in this area. It seems that educational technology is more active in visual perceptual training programs than in the auditory training area. This is unfortunate.

We should not divide ourselves by our traditional areas of exceptionality. Generally, special children go through many of the same developmental stages regardless of their disability label. Thus, basic sets of training exercises are first needed in such domains as the seven already suggested.

Finally, as already mentioned, it doesn't seem likely that special educators are going to lose concern for the individual child by devoting some energy to working out rather global programs of instruction. That special educators will follow the "cookbooks" religiously is not anticipated as a problem. Perhaps a few of the poor ones will, but what would they be doing in the classroom without these? Baby sitting? The vast majority of able teachers will use them as points of departure, modifying the lessons as needed, so that each child will make optimal progress. Therefore, it seems that if there is going to be advance in this field, a considerable amount of energy must be invested in the next decade in curriculum development, by freeing creative special educators from routine classroom mangement to devise, field test, evaluate, and refine a variety of specialized programs of instruction for handicapped children.

CEC PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE

COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION. F.E. Lord and Robert M. Isenberg (Editors). 1964. 72 pp. $1.75. Stock No. 551-19626.

COORDINATING SERVICES FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN. C. Esco Obermann. 1964. 65 pp. $1.50. Stock No. 551-16698.

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS FOR PERSONNEL IN THE EDUCATION OF EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN. 87 pp. $1.25. Stock No. 551-20944.

PUBLIC SCHOOL CLASSES FOR THE EMOTIONALLY HANDICAPPED: A RESEARCH ANALYSIS. William C. Morse, Richard L. Cutler, and Albert H. Fink. 1964 (reprinted 1967). 142 pp. $2.50. Stock No. 551-16696.

RECREATION AND PHYSICAL ACTIVITY FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED. CEC and the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation. 1966. 87 pp. $2.00. Stock No. 246-00726.

STRATEGIES OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS. Convention papers from the 44th Annual CEC Convention, 1966. 259 pp. $2.00. Stock No. 551-20948.

SELECTED CONVENTION PAPERS. Papers from the 45th Annual CEC Convention, 1967. 283 pp. $2.00. Stock No. 551-22100.

THE PRINCIPAL WORKS WITH THE VISUALLY IMPAIRED. Geraldine T. Scholl. 1968. 61 pp. $2.00. Stock No. 551-21012.

CEC RESEARCH MONOGRAPHS

Series B, No. 1. EFFECTS OF COMMUNITY AND INSTITUTIONAL SCHOOL PROGRAMS ON TRAINABLE MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN. Leo F. Cain and Samuel Levine. 1963. 56 pp. $2.00. Stock No. 551-19628.

Series B, No. 2. RESEARCH STUDIES ON THE PSYCHOLINGUISTIC BEHAVIOR OF DEAF CHILDREN. Joseph Rosenstein and Walter H. MacGinitie (Editors). 1965. 40 pp. $2.00. Stock No. 551-20182.

Series B, No. 3. FACTORS RELATED TO SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES. James C. Chalfant. 1967. 64 pp. $2.00. Stock No. 551-20974.

Series B, No. 4. THE ABILITIES OF YOUNG CHILDREN. Ruth A. Martinson and May V. Seagoe. 1967. 66 pp. $2.00. Stock No. 551-20966.

Series B, No. 5. PRODUCTIVE THINKING OF GIFTED CHILDREN IN CLASSROOM INTERACTION. James J. Gallagher, Mary Jane Aschner, and William Jenne. 1967. 103 pp. $2.00. Stock No. 551-20976.

Discount rates for all books, pamphlets, and research monographs: Quantity orders of same title for shipment to one address: 2-9 copies, 10%; 10 or more copies, 20%.

ORDERS UNDER $2.00 MUST BE ACCOMPANIED BY PAYMENT.

Address all orders to:
Publications Sales Section, National Education Association,
1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036